

VERLEN KAUTSON

151 Second Avenue
Jackson, MN 56143
February 10, 1993*The Honorable Paul Skellstone
United States Senate
Washington DC. 20510*

1993 MAR 1 PM 1:50

RECEIVED

MAR 16 1993

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY*Dear Senator Paul Skellstone*

In regard to PR Docket 92-235:

I am retired and derive many hours of enjoyment from building and operating radio controlled models. I am an active competitor and am active in several clubs. I own ten pieces of radio equipment that would be unusable if this frequency is adopted.

The models that I build weigh as much as 30 pounds and operate at 100 mph. Our club operates at a public area. Since the proposed new frequencies are so close to those that we utilize, interference will occur and render most model frequencies unusable.

I am very concerned about proposed rules that are currently under consideration by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The proceeding is PR Docket 92-235. If adopted, the new rules will greatly reduce the usability of frequencies currently assigned for model use and increase the risk of accidents and attendant liability for controlling model airplanes.

Our radio control frequencies are in the 72 - 76 MHz band. This band is primarily used for private land mobile dispatch operations. However, our radio control frequencies in this band are far enough apart from the land mobile frequencies that we have been able to share the band without either use interfering with the other.

Now the FCC wants to create more land mobile frequencies by splitting them into narrower bandwidths and rearranging the band plan. As a result, many land mobile frequencies will move closer to the radio control frequencies and cause interference to radio control operations. I am told that of the 50 frequencies that are presently available for radio control of model airplanes, only 19 frequencies will be left if these new rules are adopted.

When we fly our model airplanes under radio control, we go to great lengths to assure the safety of the operators and bystanders and the protection of property. Many of our safety precautions involve the careful coordination and use of the radio control frequencies. If the number of usable frequencies is diminished as proposed by the FCC, the remaining frequencies will become congested and the margin of safety will be greatly decreased.

Please understand that many model airplanes have wing spans up to 10 feet and weigh as much as 30 or 40 pounds. The models themselves are expensive to build; but more to the point, they are capable of causing property damage, serious injury, or even death if radio interference causes the operator to lose control of the craft. We often fly our models at organized events and contests where hundreds of operators participate. We need the use of our full complement of radio frequencies in order to assure a safe flying environment.

I do not think it is wise of the FCC to seek to improve the operating conditions of land mobile radio users at the expense of radio control modelers. The FCC may not think we are as important as business users of radios, but we have a considerable investment in our models and in our radio equipment. The hobby provides many hours of enjoyment to thousands of people like myself and contributes to the advancement and development of the commercial aviation industry.

Please help me continue the safe enjoyment of my pastime by not allowing the FCC to carry out its proposals for the 72-76 MHz band.

Sincerely,

Verlen Kautson

January 13, 1975

Senator Paul Wellstone
Washington, DC 20510-2303

ROGER
MC INERNEY
7315-17th AVE
RICHTERD
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
55423

Dear Senator -

Thank you for answering my
card re the Corporation for Public
Broadcasting. I didn't expect a
reply and I am flattered.

However, no doubt because
of the pre-printed card, my view
on CPB was misunderstood.

I have no problem with
program content - I don't like
some things, I do like some. I
have contributed ~\$2,000 to CPB

over the years.
My view is this. I believe
it is time to discontinue government
financing of CPB.

I understand the government
subsidy comprises about 20%
of CPB's budget and amount
to about one billion \$/yr
While this amount is about
of the deficit it is a stop tax
reduction.

Middle class subsidies.
As to CPB, National End
of the Arts, Natl. Inst Human
Should be discontinued.

I am a retiree and I
would/will gladly contribute
by paying more taxes on my
C. & L.A.S.

No matter which path
choose you will be criticized
as let's hate the budget, ign
AARP, CPB, NEA, NEH etc and
our finite resources where we
needed - defense, welfare and
research - Thank

PS - Heard REA
"114" "one their int" "7" printed to them.